Prepared for submission to JCAP

δM Formalism

arXiv:1609.05893v1 [gr-qc] 19 Sep 2016

A. Talebian-Ashkezari,[a] **N. Ahmadi,**[a] **A.A. Abolhasani**[b,c]

[a]Department of Physics, University of Tehran,
North Karegar Ave., Tehran 14395-547, Iran.
[b]Department of Physics, Sharif University of Technology
Azadi Ave., Tehran 11155-9161, Iran.
[c]School of Physics, Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM)
Farmanieh, Tehran 19395-5531, Iran.

E-mail: atalebian@ut.ac.ir, n.ahmadi@ut.ac.ir, abolhasani@ipm.ir

Abstract. We study the evolution of the "non-perturbative" metric perturbations in a Bianchi background in the long-wavelength limit. By applying the gradient expansion to the equations of motion we exhibit a generalized "Separate Universe" approach to the cosmological perturbation theory. Having found this consistent separate universe picture, we introduce the δM formalism for calculating the evolution of the tensor perturbations in anisotropic inflation models in almost similar way as the so-called δN formula for the super-horizon dynamics of the curvature perturbations. Likewise its ancestor, δN formalism, this new method can substantially reduce the amount of calculations related to the evolution of the tensor modes.

Contents

1 Introduction and Motivation **1**

2 Background Geometry **4**
2.1 Background Equations 5
2.1.1 Fluid and Scalar Field Description 6

3 Perturbed Geometry **7**
3.1 First Expansion Scheme: Gradient Expansion 7
3.2 Gradient Expansion of Perturbed Equations 8
3.2.1 Fluid and Scalar Field Description 9

4 Separate Universe and δM Formula **10**
4.1 δM Formula 11

5 FLRW Limit **12**
5.1 Second Expansion Scheme: Weak Shear Limit 12
5.2 Adaptive Decomposition 13
5.3 Equations of Motion 15
5.4 Choosing a Gauge 15

6 Summary and Conclusion **16**

A Conformal 3+1 Decomposition **17**
A.1 Fluid and Scalar Field Description 20

B M as an Integrated Shear **21**

C Nonlinear Gauge Transformations **23**

D Order Counting of Spatial Ricci Tensor **24**

1 Introduction and Motivation

Cosmological perturbation theory is a pivotal step in finding the predictions of the early Universe models, e.g. inflation [1]. The success of inflationary paradigm can be addressed from three aspects, even if the linear order terms are considered. At the classical level, inflating background can tell us why has the early Universe been so flat and homogeneous. At the quantum level, inflaton vacuum fluctuations (the only thing that could be survived from inflation era) can explain the presence of very tiny initial inhomogeneities, as indispensable primordial seeds for large scale structure of the Universe. At the statistical point of view (the only way for checking theory by data in cosmology) simplest inflationary models predict nearly scale invariant, adiabatic and almost Gaussian statistics almost consistent with recent observations [2]. Nevertheless, it is crucially important to go beyond the linear order to be able to discriminate among different cosmological models. For example, any tiny detection

of the non-Gaussianity would role out all the slow-roll inflationary models, since they predict non-Gaussianity of the order of the slow-roll parameters [3].

Amid different ways for studying Einstein equations, approximation methods are important tools in cosmology and specially in the analysis of the observed anisotropies of the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB). A powerful approximation technique used in cosmology is the so called "long-wavelength approximation scheme" or "gradient expansion". This method has been brought up and studied by many authors in cosmology previously [4–14]. The "quasi-isotropic" solution of Lifshitz and Khalatnikov [4, 5] who studied the general behavior of the space-time near the cosmological singularity, the "anti-Newtonian" solution of Tomita [6, 7] who investigated cosmological perturbations on super-horizon scale, and the "long-wavelength iteration scheme" of Salopek and Bond [8] all had set up on the same approximation idea, gradient expansion. Comer et al. studied the solution of Einstein equation expanded by spatial gradient via adopting the synchronous time slice [9]. Nonlinear perturbations near the cosmological singularity was also investigated by Deruelle and Langlois [10].

The gradient expansion scheme employs the spatial derivative terms which represents the ratio of the Hubble radius to the characteristic length scale of the perturbation as the expansion parameter. In other words, this scheme is built upon neglecting inhomogeneities varying over scales smaller than the Hubble radius. One important advantage of using this method is the fact that nonlinear characteristics of the dynamical equations governing the perturbations are preserved. Under some circumstances, the perturbed dynamic equations have exactly the same form as homogeneous background. In other words, the information about perturbed fields can be found through a simple "rescaling of the background" fields up to higher order corrections in gradient expansion. This is the essence of the so-called "Separate Universe" approach [11, 15, 16]. With regards to this point, δN formalism has been developed for computing super-horizon curvature perturbations ψ in the context of inflationary paradigm [16–19]. In this formalism, the long-wavelength scalar perturbations can be reabsorbed in the integrated expansion of the background geometry evaluated from some initial time t_*, when all relevant fields are sufficiently outside their horizon up to the end of inflation.

In this work, we proceed to more general background geometries for the purpose of promoting the separate universe picture to accommodate gravitational perturbations. Therefore, for this purpose, we follow the steps below:

- First of all we study the long-wavelength perturbations in Bianchi background in the 3+1, Arnowitt-Deser-Misner (ADM) decomposition [20, 21]. This decomposition has been found to be more appropriate for the purpose of applying gradient expansion [14, 18, 19, 22].

- Secondly, we apply the gradient expansion to the equations of motion and come up with a set of equations valid up to the first order of the gradient expansion but non-linear in perturbations. This set of equations are the pillars of the separate universe picture of the anisotropic inflation models.

- For the third step, we exhibit the consistent separate universe picture of the cosmological perturbation theory in the Bianchi background. We introduce the prescription of reabsorbing the perturbations into the associated background parameters in the long wavelength limit. Particularly we demonstrate that the perturbed equations can be

recast exactly in the form of background equations. As a by product, from theoretical point of view without concerning about possible applications, we study the evolution of the super-horizon metric perturbations in a Bianchi background "non-perturbatively" (but to the second order of the gradient expansion).

- Main step of this work is generalization of the the so-called δN formula, $\delta N = \psi$, to a relation applicable for tensorial degrees of freedom. Inspired by the idea of the δN formalism, one finds that the answer lies within the geometrical shear, σ_{ij} and anisotropic expansion of the perturbed Bianchi metric. The simplest models with non-vanishing shear are Bianchi space-times; this is essentially the reason of studying cosmological perturbation theory in anisotropic models. To put in another way, the Bianchi background is the simplest extension of the Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) background capable of incorporating or admitting the tensor perturbations.

- Finally, we identify the gravitational perturbations in the limit of the homogeneous background. Accordingly we exhibit the δM formalism as a prescription for calculating non-trivial tensor modes in the similar fashion as the so called δN formalism.

For the sake of clarity, it worth emphasizing that the constant long-wavelength gravitational waves are not physical degrees of freedom in the sense that it can be gauged away at leading order in gradient expansion via a large gauge transformation likewise adiabatic scalar perturbations [3, 23]. This implies that the only meaningful tensor perturbations on super-horizon scales are the "would-be" decaying modes which are the ones which correspond to the shear in an anisotropic universe. These modes always fade away in an expanding background unless they are sourced by non-negligible anisotropic stress. In other words, a FLRW space-time does not have any appropriate background dynamical quantity supporting the tensorial degrees of freedom. However, in the anisotropic inflation model [24–26], usually the anisotropic stress show up and as a result there are a bunch of non-trivial interaction between scalar and tensor modes. This actually make the calculations of the correlation function a cumbersome project. By employing the proposed δM method, the calculations of the correlation functions of the perturbations astonishingly shrink.

Several authors have studied the behavior of gravitational waves in Bianchi-I universe [27]. It is worth emphasizing that this work is *not* aimed to study the problem of the gravitational waves in a general Bianchi-I background. Instead, we exploit the Bianchi background as a suitable choice capable of incorporating tensorial degrees of freedom. This suggests that the long-wavelength tensor perturbations would redefine the integrated shear of the background metric.

In standard model of cosmology, the geometry of our Universe, smoothed on large enough scales, is well described by a spatially expanding FLRW solutions. The extra degrees of freedom that control the expansion may trigger a phase of anisotropic expansion (through an anisotropic tensor). The current CMB observations show that the deviation from isotropy is small [2, 28]. Therefore, in a gradient expansion approach, only the "weak shear limit" [29, 30] in which the induced shear is small can provide good insight into the super-horizon perturbations. In order to implement this approximation, we employ a two parameter perturbation scheme [31, 32] in which besides nonlinear perturbations the geometrical shear is also considered as an extra perturbative degree. Therefore two expansion schemes are defined; gradient expansion, for studying nonlinear long-wavelength perturbations and deriving the δM formula, and weak shear limit, as a limit in which the modes evolve independently and

reach to FLRW Universe. Therefore, as usual in this limit, all the fields are decomposed into scalar, vector and tensor modes. Two independent degrees of freedom which geometrically match gravitational waves (or vector perturbations) in FLRW space-times are identified. Our result confirms the independent evolution of these modes at linear order.

In this paper we adopt a $(-+++)$ metric signature, and will use the Greek letters $(\mu, \nu, \alpha, \beta, ... = 0, 1, 2, 3)$ and the middle Latin indices $(i, j, k, l, ... = 1, 2, 3)$ to denote space-time indices (base space) and its spatial part, respectively.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In Sec. 2 we study an anisotropic model of cosmology which provides a homogeneous set up in separate universe approach. In Sec. 3 we study the non-linearly perturbed Einstein equations and apply the gradient expansion to those equations. We show that separate universe picture holds in an anisotropic universe and derive δM formula in Sec. 4 and discuss about the dynamics of super-horizon perturbations in FLRW limit in Sec. 5. The conclusion and discussions are given in Sec. 6. Some technical details are relegated into Appendices.

2 Background Geometry

The homogeneous backgrounds can be classified by general Bianchi metrics. Among those, the simplest choice with non-zero shear is Bianchi type-I

$$\mathrm{d}s^2 = \bar{g}_{\mu\nu}\mathrm{d}x^\mu\,\mathrm{d}x^\nu = -\mathrm{d}t^2 + \bar{\gamma}_{ij}(t)\mathrm{d}x^i\,\mathrm{d}x^j\,. \tag{2.1}$$

It is well known that spatial part of the metric can be cast into the following form [33, 34]:

$$\bar{\gamma}_{ij}(t) = e^{2N(t)}\hat{\bar{\gamma}}_{ij}\,, \qquad \hat{\bar{\gamma}}_{ij} = (e^{2\boldsymbol{M}(t)})_{ij}\,, \tag{2.2}$$

where N and $\boldsymbol{M}$ represent shape-preserving volume expansion and volume-preserving shape deformation, respectively. It is clear that N is a scalar function of time and $\boldsymbol{M}$ is a symmetric trace free, 3×3 matrix. The matrix exponential is the series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(2\boldsymbol{M})^n/n!$. Furthermore since $\hat{\bar{\gamma}}_{ij}$ is a tensor density with unit-determinant, $\boldsymbol{M}$ has to be traceless. Here and from now on, a bar over any quantity denotes its unperturbed value (unless otherwise is specified), and the indices of M_{ij} will be raised by δ^{ij} and M_{ij} is a measure of the homogeneous changes in Euclidean metric; so $M_{ij} = M^i_j = M^{ij}$.

Neither N nor $\boldsymbol{M}$ has any absolute geometrical meaning at a single instant of time. In the sense that, one can eliminate them at a specific time by a constant general linear transformation. However the time derivative of these quantities are of great physical significance which will be discussed extensively in the following. As an example, for a unperturbed flat FLRW space-time, N would be integrated expansion $N = \int H\,\mathrm{d}t$ while one has $M_{ij} = 0$, where $H = \dot{a}(t)/a(t)$ is Hubble expansion rate and $a(t)$ denotes the scale factor. For an inflationary universe N is clearly the so-called total number of e-folds, $N = \ln a(t)$.

In the same manner as flat FLRW space-times, one can define an average Hubble expansion rate, H, for Bianchi space-times, as a characteristic parameter. However contrary to isotropic FLRW space-times, in Bianchi models, cosmic shear, $\hat{\bar{\sigma}}_{ij}$, as a measure of anisotropic expansion exists. The average Hubble rate and cosmic shear rate are defined in terms of time derivatives of N and M_{ij} as

$$H \equiv \dot{N}\,, \tag{2.3}$$

$$\hat{\bar{\sigma}}_{ij} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\dot{\hat{\bar{\gamma}}}_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}(e^{2\boldsymbol{M}})_{ij}\,. \tag{2.4}$$

Hence N can be interpreted as the integrated expansion,

$$N = \int H \, \mathrm{d}t \,. \tag{2.5}$$

Under the assumption that $\boldsymbol{M}$ commutes with its derivative, $[\dot{\boldsymbol{M}}, \boldsymbol{M}] = 0$ (See App. B for more details), the shear rate simply reduces to the time derivative of M_{ij}, as

$$\hat{\bar{\sigma}}^i_j = \dot{M}^i_j \,. \tag{2.6}$$

Here the indices of $\hat{\bar{\sigma}}_{ij}$ are raised by $\hat{\bar{\gamma}}^{ij} = (e^{-2\boldsymbol{M}})^{ij}$. Therefore M_{ij} can be interpreted as integrated shear,

$$M^i_j = \int \hat{\bar{\sigma}}^i_j \, \mathrm{d}t \,. \tag{2.7}$$

Applying $(3+1)$-decomposition on the metric (2.1), the components of $\bar{\boldsymbol{n}}$, the unit time-like vector normal to the constant cosmic time hyper-surface $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_t$, will be

$$\bar{n}^\mu = \left[1, \vec{0}\right] , \qquad \bar{n}_\mu = \left[-1, \vec{0}\right] . \tag{2.8}$$

The expansion rate of the $\bar{\boldsymbol{n}}$ congruence is given by

$$\bar{\Theta} = 3\dot{N} \,, \tag{2.9}$$

and its shear rate $\bar{\sigma}_{ij}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\sigma}_{ij} &= e^{2N} \hat{\bar{\sigma}}_{ij} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} e^{2N} \, \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} (e^{2\boldsymbol{M}})_{ij} \,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

Note that indices of $\bar{\sigma}_{ij}$ can be raised by $\bar{\gamma}^{ij} = e^{-2N} \hat{\bar{\gamma}}^{ij}$, therefore $\bar{\sigma}^i_j = \hat{\bar{\sigma}}^i_j = \dot{M}^i_j$.

2.1 Background Equations

In App. A, we discuss about the Einstein equations in terms of the variables of the ADM formalism. In this subsection we study Eqs. (A.16)-(A.21) and continuity Eqs. (A.22)-(A.23) in the *background* space-time (2.1). In cosmic time, t, The only non-zero Christoffel symbols of (2.1) are

$$\bar{\Gamma}^0_{ij} = e^{2N} [\dot{N} \hat{\bar{\gamma}}_{ij} + \hat{\bar{\sigma}}_{ij}] \,, \quad \bar{\Gamma}^i_{0j} = e^{2N} [\dot{N} \delta^i_j + \hat{\bar{\sigma}}^i_j] \,. \tag{2.11}$$

The extrinsic curvature of this hyper-surface, $K_{ij} = -\nabla_i \bar{n}_j$, is usually decomposed into trace part, K, and trace free part, $\hat{A}_{ij}$, as

$$K_{ij} = \frac{1}{3} K \bar{\gamma}_{ij} + e^{2N} \hat{A}_{ij} \,. \tag{2.12}$$

Using Eqs. (A.13) and (A.14) we get

$$K = -3\dot{N} \,, \tag{2.13}$$

$$\hat{A}_{ij} = -\hat{\bar{\sigma}}_{ij} = -\frac{1}{2} \dot{\hat{\bar{\gamma}}}_{ij} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} (e^{2\boldsymbol{M}})_{ij} \,. \tag{2.14}$$

Plugging a homogeneous energy momentum tensor $T_{ij}(t)$ in Hamiltonian constraint, evolution equations for components of extrinsic curvature, K and $\hat{A}_{ij}$, are given by

$$\frac{2}{3}K^2 = \frac{2}{M_P^2}E + \hat{A}_{ij}\hat{A}^{ij}\,, \tag{2.15}$$

$$\dot{K} = \hat{A}_{ij}\hat{A}^{ij} + \frac{1}{3}K^2 + \frac{1}{2M_P^2}(E+S)\,, \tag{2.16}$$

$$\dot{\hat{A}}_{ij} = -\frac{1}{M_P^2}\hat{S}_{ij} + K\hat{A}_{ij} - 2\hat{A}_{ik}\hat{A}^k_j\,. \tag{2.17}$$

Here $E = T_{00}$ is energy density, S and $\hat{S}_{ij}$ are trace and trace free part of stress tensor, respectively. Moreover, the momentum density $J_i = T_{0i}$, vanishes from the momentum constraint (A.17). (for details see App. A). Also the energy conservation equation (A.22) is given by

$$\dot{E} + 3\dot{N}(E + \frac{1}{3}S) + \hat{\bar{\sigma}}_{ij}\hat{S}^{ij} = 0\,. \tag{2.18}$$

2.1.1 Fluid and Scalar Field Description

If matter can be described as a fluid, we consider the following form of the background energy momentum tensor

$$\bar{T}_{\mu\nu} = (\bar{\rho} + \bar{p})\,\bar{u}_\mu\,\bar{u}_\nu + \bar{p}\,\bar{g}_{\mu\nu} + \bar{\pi}_{\mu\nu}\,. \tag{2.19}$$

As we will note in App. A, $\bar{\rho}$, $\bar{p}$ and $\bar{\pi}_{\mu\nu}$ are the relativistic energy density, the isotropic and the anisotropic pressure, respectively. Moreover momentum constraint dictates that heat transfer must vanish. $\bar{u}^\mu$ is the fluid's four-vector velocity, which its components in the comoving coordinate associated with the fluid read as

$$\bar{u}^\mu = \left[1, \vec{0}\right]\,, \qquad \bar{u}_\mu = \left[-1, \vec{0}\right]\,. \tag{2.20}$$

In this case fluid's velocity is not tilted relative to the normal vector of constant time hypersurface, i.e. $\bar{\boldsymbol{n}} = \bar{\boldsymbol{u}}$. It is easily to check that $E = \rho$, $J_i = 0$, $S = 3p$ and $\hat{S}_{ij} = e^{-2N}\bar{\pi}_{ij} \equiv \hat{\bar{\pi}}_{ij}$.

We also note that the momentum constraint (A.17) holds trivially. Moreover, by means of (2.11), (2.19) and (2.20), the energy conservation equation, $-u_\mu \nabla_\nu T^{\mu\nu} = 0$, can be found as

$$\dot{\bar{\rho}} + 3\dot{N}(\bar{\rho} + \bar{p}) + \hat{\bar{\sigma}}_{ij}\hat{\bar{\pi}}^{ij} = 0\,. \tag{2.21}$$

It is worth mentioning that the evolution of a scalar field (A.34) in this background is given by the following equation

$$\left(\sqrt{\bar{\gamma}}\dot{\bar{\varphi}}\right)^{\cdot} + \sqrt{\bar{\gamma}}\; V_\varphi = 0\,, \tag{2.22}$$

where $\bar{\gamma} = \det[\bar{\gamma}_{ij}] = e^{6N}$.

3 Perturbed Geometry

Having calculated background equation of a Bianchi-I universe, it is time to tackle the problem in the presence of the perturbations. We write the perturbed metric in the ADM (3+1 decomposition) form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}s^2 &= g_{\mu\nu}\mathrm{d}x^\mu \mathrm{d}x^\nu \\ &= -\alpha^2(t,\mathbf{x})\ \mathrm{d}t^2 + \gamma_{ij}(t,\mathbf{x})\Big(\mathrm{d}x^i + \beta^i(t,\mathbf{x})\ \mathrm{d}t\Big)\Big(\mathrm{d}x^j + \beta^j(t,\mathbf{x})\ \mathrm{d}t\Big)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where α and β^i are lapse function and shift vector, respectively in ADM approach and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is the spatial metric of constant-t hyper-surfaces, $g_{ij} = \gamma_{ij}$. The spatial indices can be raised and lowered by γ_{ij}, e.g. $\beta_i = \gamma_{ij}\beta^j$. We consider the following decomposition for the perturbed spatial metric

$$\gamma_{ij}(t,\mathbf{x}) = e^{2\mathcal{N}(t,\mathbf{x})}(e^{2\boldsymbol{\mathcal{M}}(t,\mathbf{x})})_{ij}\,, \tag{3.2}$$

where $\mathcal{N}$ is the scalar function and $\mathcal{M}_{ij}$ is a traceless 3×3 matrix. Then, we separate the homogeneous and inhomogeneous parts of $\mathcal{N}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{ij}$ in this way

$$\mathcal{N}(t,\mathbf{x}) = N(t) + \psi(t,\mathbf{x})\,, \tag{3.3}$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{ij}(t,\mathbf{x}) = M_{ij}(t) + h_{ij}(t,\mathbf{x})\,, \tag{3.4}$$

in which ψ and h_{ij} are metric perturbations. Similar to FLRW background, ψ quantifies the curvature perturbations. h_{ij} may be represented by 3×3 symmetric traceless matrix which can be decomposed into scalar, vector and tensor modes in Bianchi-I backgrounds [25, 26].

In the rest of this section, we discuss about the evolution equations in long-wavelength perturbations limit. As it is mentioned in introduction, a successful approach to study these perturbations, would be the gradient expansion method.

3.1 First Expansion Scheme: Gradient Expansion

In the long-wavelength limit, the terms with spatial derivatives in the equations of motion are negligible and the gradient expansion method suggests to expand those equations in powers of "gradient operator", ∂_k. To be more specific, to get an estimation of different terms we have to compare two characteristic scales. At each point $\mathbf{x}$ on a spatial hyper-surface with the spatial three metric $\gamma_{ij}(t,\mathbf{x})$, there are two characteristic scales. The first is the characteristic comoving length, L as the scale of inhomogeneity, on which the metric varies

$$\partial_k\gamma_{ij} \sim L^{-1}\gamma_{ij}\,. \tag{3.5}$$

On the scales much less than L, the space is almost homogeneous and the 3-metric depends only on time. It is worth emphasizing that, on these scales the metric is homogeneous but not necessarily isotropic [35]. The second scale is the characteristic proper time, H^{-1}, on which the 3-metric evolves

$$\partial_t\gamma_{ij} \sim H\gamma_{ij}\,, \tag{3.6}$$

where $H = \dfrac{\dot{a}}{a}$ and $a = (\det[\gamma_{ij}])^{1/6}$ is a local scale factor. Here, and throughout, overdots denote derivatives with respect to cosmic time t.

In the scales shorter than characteristic length scale L, one can safely ignore all the spatial gradient terms with respect to the time derivative terms:

$$\frac{1}{a}\partial_k\gamma_{ij} \ll \partial_t\gamma_{ij} \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad aL \gg H^{-1}\,. \tag{3.7}$$

In the language of perturbation theory, L^{-1} is related to the comoving wavenumber of perturbations, k. So we can define gradient expansion parameter as

$$\epsilon \equiv \frac{k}{aH}\,. \tag{3.8}$$

Following the prescription of the gradient expansion method, we multiply every spatial derivative operator by ϵ and expand the equations in the power of ϵ. Assuming (3.7), we have $\epsilon \ll 1$, so one can omit higher order terms in ϵ to the desired accuracy.

At the leading order in ϵ (i.e. omitting all the spatial gradients) the universe locally evolves like the homogeneous background universe with appropriate modified parameter. In other words, in the long-wavelength limit, say $L \to \infty$, all the perturbations vanish except those which can be absorbed in the suitable background parameters. By this assumption, the universe at each position will evolve as if it were homogeneous, which means the fields will obey evolution equations like those in a homogeneous universe, but now described by a local scale factor and Hubble expansion rate. This approach is the separate universe approach to the cosmological perturbation theory. In the separate universe picture there exists an appropriate set of coordinates in which the metric and equations of motions of any local region can be written as the unperturbed background's forms.

3.2 Gradient Expansion of Perturbed Equations

Since we are interested in nonlinear long-wavelength perturbations, we shall apply gradient expansion on the field equations. our physical assumption is that the smoothing length is infinitively large, i.e. $\epsilon \to 0$. Then all the perturbative quantities ($\alpha - 1$, β_i, ψ, h_{ij}, δE, δS, $\mathcal{J}_i$, $\delta\hat{S}_{ij}$) must disappear in this limit and the universe becomes locally a Bianchi one. To be precise, by locally we mean, a region sufficiently larger than Hubble horizon H^{-1}, but significantly smaller than the smoothing scale L).

There are two classes of perturbations. First, those who have background *counterparts*, or in other words, they can be reabsorbed in corresponding background quantities. The second class, are the perturbations which are *not supported* by the background dynamics. these parameters must vanish by going to the smoothing limit, $\epsilon \to 0$. In this subsection we shall show that α, ψ, h_{ij}, δE, δS, and $\delta\hat{S}_{ij}$ correspond to the first class, whilst β_i and $\mathcal{J}_i$ must vanish in this limit, namely as $\beta_i \sim \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^n)$, and $\mathcal{J}_i \sim \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{n'})$.

Let us examine what the momentum constraint tells us about the gradient expansion ordering of β_i and $\mathcal{J}_i$. Plugging

$$\mathcal{J}_i = \frac{1}{\alpha}(T_{i0} - \beta^k T_{ki}) \tag{3.9}$$

into Eq. (A.17) yields

$$D_j\hat{\mathcal{A}}^j_i - \frac{2}{3}\partial_i\mathcal{K} = \frac{1}{M_P^2}\frac{1}{\alpha}(\beta^k T_{ki} - T_{i0})\,. \tag{3.10}$$

Hence, the momentum constraint can be satisfied if the magnitudes of shift vector and T_{i0} are at most of the first order in the parameter of gradient expansion, say

$$\mathcal{J}_i \sim T_{i0} \sim \beta_i \sim \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)\,. \tag{3.11}$$

This result would be our guideline to apply gradient expansion to the field equations. Now, by using (A.13) and (A.14) and noting that $\beta_i \sim \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$, trace and traceless parts of the extrinsic curvature, will be

$$\mathcal{K} = -3\mathcal{N}' + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)\,, \quad \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{ij} = -\hat{\sigma}_{ij} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)\,, \tag{3.12}$$

where

$$\hat{\sigma}_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}\hat{\gamma}'_{ij}\,, \quad \hat{\gamma}_{ij} = (e^{2\boldsymbol{\mathcal{M}}})_{ij}\,. \tag{3.13}$$

Here, and throughout, the primes indicate derivative with respect to proper time, τ,

$$\mathrm{d}\tau = (\alpha^2 - \beta^k\beta_k)^{1/2}\ \mathrm{d}t = \alpha\ \mathrm{d}t + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)\,. \tag{3.14}$$

Using a general energy momentum tensor $T_{\mu\nu}(t, \mathbf{x})$, ADM equations (A.16),(A.18)-(A.21) read as:

$$\frac{2}{3}\mathcal{K}^2 = \frac{2}{M_P^2}\mathcal{E} + \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{ij}\hat{\mathcal{A}}^{ij} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)\,, \tag{3.15}$$

$$\mathcal{K}' = \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{ij}\hat{\mathcal{A}}^{ij} + \frac{1}{3}\mathcal{K}^2 + \frac{1}{2M_P^2}(\mathcal{E} + \mathcal{S}) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)\,, \tag{3.16}$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{A}}'_{ij} = -\frac{1}{M_P^2}\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{ij} + \mathcal{K}\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{ij} - 2\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{ik}\hat{\mathcal{A}}^k_j + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)\,. \tag{3.17}$$

The above relations form a complete set of equations for studying the dynamics of a smoothed patch of the Universe. Also the continuity equation (A.22) is given by

$$\mathcal{E}' + 3\mathcal{N}'(\mathcal{E} + \frac{1}{3}\mathcal{S}) + \hat{\sigma}_{ij}\hat{\mathcal{S}}^{ij} = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)\,. \tag{3.18}$$

3.2.1 Fluid and Scalar Field Description

Using the definition of the energy momentum tensor for a generalized fluid (A.26), the momentum density is given by

$$-\mathcal{J}_i = q_i + \frac{1}{\alpha}(\beta^k + v^k)\,(\pi_{ik} + (\rho + p)\gamma_{ik}) + \mathcal{O}(\beta^3, v^3, \beta^2 v, \beta v^2, v^3, \beta^2 q, v^2 q, \beta v q)\,. \tag{3.19}$$

Therefore, one can satisfy the momentum constraint by considering that the first non-zero terms in gradient expansion of the shift vector, spatial velocity and heat transfer are

$$\beta_i \sim v_i \sim q_i \sim \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)\,. \tag{3.20}$$

The first relation in (A.27) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} q_0 &= -v^i q_i \sim \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)\,, \\ \pi_{00} &= v^i v^j \pi_{ij} \sim \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)\,, \\ \pi_{0i} &= -v^j \pi_{ij} \sim \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

Using above gradient expansion ordering, one can see that $\mathcal{E} = \rho/\alpha^2 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$, $\mathcal{S} = 3p + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$, $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{ij} = e^{-2\mathcal{N}}\pi_{ij} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) \equiv \hat{\pi}_{ij} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$.

It would be advantageous to apply the gradient expansion to the continuity equation and the equation of motion of a scalar field. Using (3.20), (3.21), and the ordering of Christoffel symbols given in App. D, one can see that the energy is conserved up to $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$,

$$\rho' + 3\mathcal{N}'(\rho + p) + \hat{\sigma}_{ij}\hat{\pi}^{ij} = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)\,. \tag{3.22}$$

Also, by using Cramer's rule, $g = -\alpha^2\gamma$, where $g = \det[g_{ij}]$ and $\gamma = \det[\gamma_{ij}]$, the equation of motion of a scalar field (A.34) can be rewritten as

$$\left(\sqrt{\gamma}\varphi'\right)' + \sqrt{\gamma}\; V_\varphi = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)\,, \tag{3.23}$$

where $\gamma = \det[\gamma_{ij}] = e^{6\mathcal{N}} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$.

4 Separate Universe and δM Formula

As it is mentioned before, the main endeavor of the so-called separate universe approach to the perturbation theory is to recast the perturbation equations (in the long-wavelength limit) in the form of the background equations. Comparing the perturbed equations (3.15)- (3.17) with that of the homogeneous background (2.15)- (2.17), it can be readily found that one can deduce the perturbed equations from of the background equations through the following replacements miraculously,

$$t \to \tau(t, \mathbf{x})\,, \tag{4.1}$$
$$K(t) \to \mathcal{K}(t, \mathbf{x})\,, \tag{4.2}$$
$$\hat{A}_{ij}(t) \to \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{ij}(t, \mathbf{x})\,, \tag{4.3}$$
$$E(t) \to \mathcal{E}(t, \mathbf{x})\,, \tag{4.4}$$
$$S(t) \to \mathcal{S}(t, \mathbf{x})\,, \tag{4.5}$$
$$\hat{S}_{ij}(t) \to \hat{\mathcal{S}}_{ij}(t, \mathbf{x})\,. \tag{4.6}$$

Moreover, the perturbed continuity equation (3.22) and perturbed scalar field equation (3.23) conform to the background versions (2.21) and (2.22) applying the above replacements. Let us emphasize that Eqs. (3.15)-(3.17) are valid to *all order* in perturbations δ with corrections up to second order of gradient expansion ϵ. Note that the gradient expansion parameters can be chosen arbitrarily small irrespective of the order of perturbations. The above results, indicate that

> *Every super-horizon smoothed patch of the Universe (with the size much smaller than the wavelength of the perturbations) evolves like a separate Bianchi universe where the energy density and stress tensor take different values.*

This shows that there is a consistent separate universe picture for the case of the generalized fluid in the Bianchi geometry.

The fundamental result of the above analysis is that "the functional form of the evolution of each perturbed separate universe patch is the same as the background." Hence, the solution for the perturbed equation can be momentarily found by performing simple replacements on the background solutions. It is worth mentioning that all the information

about inhomogeneities are enfolded in the initial conditions and in the proper time τ. For an example, assuming the following form for the solution of the scalar field equation (2.22),

$$\bar{\varphi}(t) = \bar{\varphi}[t, \bar{\varphi}_0(t_0), \dot{\bar{\varphi}}_0(t_0)]\,, \tag{4.7}$$

the perturbed equation (3.23) can be solved almost for free as

$$\varphi(\tau, \mathbf{x}) = \bar{\varphi}[\tau, \varphi_0(\tau_0, \mathbf{x}), \varphi_0'(\tau_0, \mathbf{x})]\,. \tag{4.8}$$

4.1 δM Formula

The most important conclusion emerging from the gradient expansion of Einstein field equations is that perturbed quantities ψ and h_{ij} can be calculated, once we know the variations of N and M_{ij} with respect to the initial values of fields Φ_I. For the sake of brevity, here we use Φ_I to refer to scalar fields, vector fields or higher order tensor fields which take part in the problem and their time derivatives. To this purpose, it is more convenient to translate Eqs. (4.2) and (4.3) to the following modifications of the spatial metric components

$$N(t) \to \mathcal{N}(t, \mathbf{x}) = N(t) + \psi(t, \mathbf{x})\,, \tag{4.9}$$

$$M_{ij}(t) \to \mathcal{M}_{ij}(t, \mathbf{x}) = M_{ij}(t) + h_{ij}(t, \mathbf{x})\,, \tag{4.10}$$

in which we used Eqs. (2.13), (2.14), (3.12), and (3.13). The above equations suggest that $\psi(t, \mathbf{x})$ and $h_{ij}(t, \mathbf{x})$ in each time can be calculated by subtracting the reference cosmology parameters N and M_{ij} from the local ones $\mathcal{N}(t, \mathbf{x})$ and $\mathcal{M}_{ij}(t, \mathbf{x})$, respectively,

$$\psi(t, \mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}(t_0; t, \mathbf{x}) - N(t_0; t)\,, \tag{4.11}$$

$$h_{ij}(t, \mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{M}_{ij}(t_0; t, \mathbf{x}) - M_{ij}(t_0; t)\,, \tag{4.12}$$

in which $\mathbf{x}$ is used to show the location of each patch of the separate universes.

The next step would be solving background N and M_{ij}, for general initial value of the fields. We know that the background values of the integrated expansion $N(t)$ and integrated shear $M_{ij}(t)$ depend on the initial conditions of the fields Φ_I as $N\left(\Phi_I(t_0), \Phi_I(t)\right)$ and $M_{ij}\left(\Phi_I(t_0), \Phi_I(t)\right)$. As noted above, at the separate universe approach, the physical quantities defined on a perturbed patch evolve like the background except for a difference in the initial conditions; accordingly, the solutions of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ in general have the following form

$$\mathcal{N}(t_0; t, \mathbf{x}) = N\left(\Phi_I(t_0, \mathbf{x}), \Phi_I(t, \mathbf{x})\right)\,, \tag{4.13}$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{ij}(t_0; t, \mathbf{x}) = M_{ij}\left(\Phi_I(t_0, \mathbf{x}), \Phi_I(t, \mathbf{x})\right)\,. \tag{4.14}$$

The Eqs. (4.11) and (4.12) can then be solved for ψ and h_{ij} as

$$\psi(t, \mathbf{x}) = N\big(\bar{\Phi} + \delta\Phi(t, \mathbf{x})\big) - N(\bar{\Phi})\,, \tag{4.15}$$

$$h_{ij}(t, \mathbf{x}) = M_{ij}\big(\bar{\Phi} + \delta\Phi(t, \mathbf{x})\big) - M_{ij}(\bar{\Phi})\,. \tag{4.16}$$

Usually, it is more convenient to expand the above result for ψ and h_{ij} in the powers of initial value of fields

$$\psi = \delta\mathsf{N} = \sum_I \mathsf{N}_{,I}\,\delta\Phi_I + \sum_{IJ} \mathsf{N}_{,IJ}\,\delta\Phi_I\,\delta\Phi_J + \dots\,, \tag{4.17}$$

$$h_{ij} = \delta\mathsf{M}_{ij} = \sum_I \mathsf{M}_{ij,I}\,\delta\Phi_I + \sum_{IJ} \mathsf{M}_{ij,IJ}\,\delta\Phi_I\,\delta\Phi_J + \dots\,. \tag{4.18}$$

Here we assume that $\Phi_I(t)$ has fixed values in every patch and

$$\mathsf{N}_{,I} \equiv \frac{\partial N}{\partial \Phi_I}|_{\Phi_I=\bar{\Phi}_I}\,, \qquad \mathsf{N}_{,IJ} \equiv \frac{\partial^2 N}{\partial \Phi_I \partial \Phi_J}|_{\Phi_I=\bar{\Phi}_I}\,, \tag{4.19}$$

$$\mathsf{M}_{ij,I} \equiv \frac{\partial M_{ij}}{\partial \Phi_I}|_{\Phi_I=\bar{\Phi}_I}\,, \qquad \mathsf{M}_{ij,IJ} \equiv \frac{\partial^2 M_{ij}}{\partial \Phi_I \partial \Phi_J}|_{\Phi_I=\bar{\Phi}_I}\,. \tag{4.20}$$

The Eqs. (4.17) and (4.18) are our δN and δM formula in the Bianchi space-times.

5 FLRW Limit

In previous section, we considered Bianchi type-I model as a useful model for describing the background and showed that the super-horizon perturbations which can not be absorbed by integrated expansion, can be absorbed by anisotropies. However, a realistic and observationally consistent model for the Universe is a simple FLRW model with high spatial symmetry. Our achievements would be untenable unless we study the perturbations on a near isotropic Bianchi model. To elaborate on this, we need a two parameter perturbation scheme introduced in [31]. In this section, we first discuss about the cosmological application of two parameter perturbation theory and then study a classification of the perturbations in an adoptive decomposition. We will find the dynamics of each class and then examine some gauge choices which completely fix the freedoms associated with general coordinate transformations.

5.1 Second Expansion Scheme: Weak Shear Limit

One can intuitively recognize that a measure of anisotropy is small in a near isotropic Bianchi model. To define this measure, we note that the the eigenvalues of $\delta_{ij}\dot{N} + \hat{\bar{\sigma}}_{ij}$ are the directional Hubble parameters rate, H_i [33]. Therefore one appropriate measure of the amount of anisotropy is the root mean square difference in the various directional Hubble rates, ΔH, given by

$$3(\Delta H)^2 = (H_1 - H_2)^2 + (H_2 - H_3)^2 + (H_3 - H_1)^2\,. \tag{5.1}$$

And a dimensionless measure called the expansion normalized shear is defined by

$$m \equiv \frac{\Delta H}{H} = \frac{\sigma}{\dot{N}}\,. \tag{5.2}$$

Here $\sigma \equiv \sqrt{\hat{\bar{\sigma}}_{ij}\hat{\bar{\sigma}}^{ij}} = \Delta H$. There is a theoretical upper bound on m (and in turn on $\hat{\bar{\sigma}}_{ij}\hat{\bar{\sigma}}^{ij}$). The local positivity of energy density in the Hamiltonian constraint (2.15) implies that $m < \sqrt{6}$ whereas observational data leads to $m \sim 10^{-7}$ [2, 28]. It is easy to see that Eqs. (2.16) and (2.17) are the modified Friedmann and Raychaudhuri equations, respectively and since shear enhances the deceleration, the value of the dimensionless parameter, m, is constrained by Big-Bang nucleosynthesis considerations. It is believed that anisotropies were larger at early Universe; with shear diverging at $(1+z)^3$ for $z \to \infty$.

With regard to the above considerations, we shall linearize about a background FLRW solution by requiring

$$M^i_j \simeq \mathcal{O}(m)\,, \quad \hat{\bar{\sigma}}^i_j \simeq \mathcal{O}(mH)\,, \quad \hat{S}^i_j \simeq \mathcal{O}(mH^2)\,, \tag{5.3}$$

and ignore nonlinear corrections in shear. To implement this approximation scheme, we propose a two-parameter perturbation scheme. We consider a background FLRW space-time and a family of space-time models diffeomorphic to the background for describing the perturbed geometrics. Each member of the family is labeled by some value of parameters (m, δ), representing the shear and perturbation strength, respectively. The implicit fundamental assumption in our application of two-parameter perturbation theory is that besides the usual metric and matter perturbation, the geometrical shear (and/or anisotropic stress) is also considered as an extra perturbative degree. For any quantity X, in this approach one considers a perturbation series $X = \sum_{m,\delta=0}^{\infty} X^{(m,\delta)}$ in which (m, δ) indicates powers in σ and the order of (matter/metric) perturbation. In small shear approximation, m is limited to be either zero of one. One can check that a perturbation like ψ is of order (0,1), however, different components of h_{ij} are of order (1,1). Because these modes only grow due to the coupling with shear [1].

In general, each perturbational mode has its own dynamics. Nevertheless, one can read the dynamics of long-wavelength perturbations of order $(1, \delta)$ through that of $(1, 0)$. This is the first application of the separate universe picture (or δM formalism) described in previous section. It is also possible to obtain the equations governing ψ from that of δN formalism. In the following we show that how the equations governing the long-wavelength perturbations on FLRW space-time can be recovered.

5.2 Adaptive Decomposition

We started from 10 perturbations in the metric (3.1) plus 5 anisotropy modes. Of these perturbations 4 are gauge modes, which can be set to zero once we fix the gauge. Of the remaining modes, only 7 are dynamical (physical). A convenient method to extract the dynamical ones, is to fix the gauge completely without eliminating any $\delta g_{0\mu}$ mode. All these perturbations live in an isotropic FLRW universe and we recall that a classification into scalar, 3d vector and tensor modes (SVT decomposition) is very useful in a standard perturbation theory. The framework of linear perturbation theory developed in [25] introduces Fourier and SVT decomposition of each mode on a basis adapted to its wave vector.

Any 3-d geometrical object, as a function of comoving coordinate $\{x^i\}$ and time, can be Fourier decomposed as

$$f(t, x^i) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{3/2}} \int \mathrm{d}^3 k_i \ \tilde{f}(t, k_i) e^{i k_i x^i} \,. \tag{5.4}$$

Here, standard plane waves are used as basis at each constant time hyper-surface. k_is are constant comoving co-vectors; while the direction of wave vectors, k^is, changes with time. The modulus $k^2 = k_i k^i$ and unit vector $\hat{k}^i \equiv k^i/k$ evolve as

$$\frac{k'}{k} = -\hat{\bar{\sigma}}^{ij} \hat{k}_i \hat{k}_j \,, \qquad (\hat{k}^i)' = (\hat{\bar{\sigma}}^{jl} \hat{k}_j \hat{k}_l) \hat{k}^i - 2 \hat{\bar{\sigma}}^{ij} \hat{k}_j \,. \tag{5.5}$$

A set of local, orthonormal basis $\{\hat{k}_i, e^2_i, e^3_i\}$ span the constant time hyper-surface. $\hat{k}^i$ corresponds to the normalized momentum of the mode and bases $\{e^2_i, e^3_i\}$ span the subspace

[1] Note that the standard gravitational waves in isotropic limit, h_{ij}, which are of order (0,1) in double expansion scheme, are constant on super horizon scales up to second order of gravitational waves and as a result can be gauged away [18].

orthogonal to $\hat{k}^i$ [2]. In an anisotropic space, the SVT modes do not commute with time evolution. Therefore, the modes which are decoupled at first order, will couple as time evolves. In this section we limit ourselves to linear perturbations; so we ignore the nonlinear coupling between different modes. We will focus on a mode with comoving momentum k^i along the anisotropic direction, as a prototype of modes in a class, without any loss of generality.

All symmetric traceless tensors collectively labeled by $X_{ij} = \{\hat{\sigma}_{ij}, \hat{S}_{ij}, ...\}$ have 5 independent components. In a given coordinate $\{x^i\}$, it has 2 physical modes. the 3 remaining degrees of freedom are associated with the Euler angles required in a purely spatial coordinate transformation. X_{ij} can be decomposed on the local basis introduced above as

$$X_{ij} = \frac{3}{2}(\hat{k}_i\hat{k}_j - \frac{1}{3}\hat{\gamma}_{ij})X_\parallel + 2\sum_{a=2,3}\hat{k}_{(i}e^a_{j)}X_a + \sum_{\lambda=+,\times} e^\lambda_{ij}X_\lambda\,. \tag{5.8}$$

New functions $\{X_\parallel, X_a, X_\lambda\}$ are obtained by projecting along $\hat{k}^i\hat{k}^j$, $\hat{k}^{(i}e_a^{j)}$ and the polarization tensor e^λ_{ij} defined as

$$e^\lambda_{ij} = \frac{e^2_i e^2_j - e^3_i e^3_j}{\sqrt{2}}\delta^\lambda_+ + \frac{e^2_i e^3_j + e^3_i e^2_j}{\sqrt{2}}\delta^\lambda_\times\,. \tag{5.9}$$

It can be easily checked that

$$\hat{\gamma}_{ij}X^{ij} = 0\,, \quad X_\parallel = X_{ij}k^ik^j\,, \quad X_a = X_{ij}k^ie^j_a\,, \quad X_\lambda = X_{ij}e^{ij}_\lambda\,. \tag{5.10}$$

The components of matrices M_{ij} and h_{ij} are similar to those of X^i_j.

Eq. (5.10) implies that the scalar shear tensor has the following decomposition in terms of shear components

$$\sigma^2 \equiv \hat{\bar{\sigma}}^{ij}\hat{\bar{\sigma}}_{ij} = \frac{3}{2}\sigma^2_\parallel + 2\sum_{a=2,3}\sigma^2_a + \sum_{\lambda=+,\times}\sigma^2_\lambda\,. \tag{5.11}$$

Similarly, the combination term that appears in continuity equation (2.18) is given by

$$\hat{\bar{\sigma}}^{ij}\hat{S}_{ij} = \frac{3}{2}\sigma_\parallel\hat{S}_\parallel + 2\sum_{a=2,3}\sigma_a\hat{S}_a + \sum_{\lambda=+,\times}\sigma_\lambda\hat{S}_\lambda\,. \tag{5.12}$$

The theoretical bound on σ_{ij} translates to that on the components: $\sigma_\parallel < 2H$ and $\sigma_\lambda < \sqrt{6}H$. In the last two displayed equations, we omitted hat and bar of shear components for brevity and go on in the rest of this section.

[2] The decomposition of a 3d vector and a transverse tensor in this basis are given by

$$V_i = (\hat{k}^jV_j)\hat{k}_i + P^j_iV_j, \tag{5.6}$$

$$V_{ij} = (\frac{1}{3}\hat{\gamma}^{kl}V_{kl})\hat{\gamma}_{ij} + (\frac{3}{2}T^{kl}V_{kl})T_{ij} + 2\hat{k}_{(i}(P^m_{j)}\hat{k}^nV_{mn}) + \Lambda^{mn}_{ij}V_{mn}. \tag{5.7}$$

Here $P_{ij} \equiv \hat{\gamma}_{ij} - \hat{k}_i\hat{k}_j$, $T_{ij} \equiv \hat{k}_i\hat{k}_j - \frac{1}{3}\hat{\gamma}_{ij}$ and $\Lambda^{ab}_{ij} \equiv P^a_iP^b_j - \frac{1}{2}P_{ij}P^{ab}$ are the projection operator onto the subspace perpendicular to $\hat{k}^i$, trace extracting operator and the projector on tensor modes, respectively.

5.3 Equations of Motion

The time evolution of shear components $(\sigma_\parallel, \sigma_a, \sigma_\lambda)$ is easily obtained from Eq. (2.17), once (2.14) is used to define $\hat{A}_{ij}$;

$$\dot{\sigma}_\parallel + 3\dot{N}\sigma_\parallel = \frac{1}{M_P^2}\hat{S}_\parallel - 2\sum_a \sigma_a^2\,, \tag{5.13}$$

$$\dot{\sigma}_a + 3\dot{N}\sigma_a = \frac{1}{M_P^2}\hat{S}_a + \frac{3}{2}\sigma_a\sigma_\parallel - 2\sum_{b,\lambda}\sigma_b\sigma_\lambda C^\lambda_{ab}\,, \tag{5.14}$$

$$\dot{\sigma}_\lambda + 3\dot{N}\sigma_\lambda = \frac{1}{M_P^2}\hat{S}_\lambda + 2\sum_{a,b}\sigma_a\sigma_b C^\lambda_{ab}\,, \tag{5.15}$$

where C^λ_{ab} is defined as

$$C^\lambda_{ab} = e^i_a\, e^j_b\, e^\lambda_{ij}\,. \tag{5.16}$$

These equations are exact and can be used to derive the time evolution of M_{ij} components. In App. B we show that $\hat{\sigma}^i_j = \dot{M}^i_j + \mathcal{O}(m^3 H)$, so we conclude that

$$\sigma_\parallel \sim \hat{\gamma}^{il}\hat{k}_l\hat{k}_j\dot{M}^i_j = \dot{M}_\parallel - (\hat{\gamma}^{il}\hat{k}_l\hat{k}_j)^{\cdot}\, M^i_j = \dot{M}_\parallel + \mathcal{O}(m^2 H)\,, \tag{5.17}$$

$$\sigma_a \sim \hat{\gamma}^{jl}\hat{k}_i e^a_l\dot{M}^i_j = \dot{M}_a - (\hat{\gamma}^{jl}\hat{k}_i e^a_l)^{\cdot}\, M_{ij} = \dot{M}_a + \mathcal{O}(m^2 H)\,, \tag{5.18}$$

$$\sigma_\lambda \sim \hat{\gamma}^{jl}e^\lambda_{li}\dot{M}^i_j = \dot{M}_\lambda - (\hat{\gamma}^{jl}e^\lambda_{li})^{\cdot}\, M^i_j = \dot{M}_\lambda + \mathcal{O}(m^2 H)\,. \tag{5.19}$$

Here $\sim$ will be replaced with equality sign if $[\boldsymbol{M}, \dot{\boldsymbol{M}}] = 0$. The basis vectors $\{\hat{k}_i, e^a_i\}$ and consequently the polarization tensor e^λ_{ij} have non-vanishing time derivative in order to keep their orthonormal structure on each constant time hyper-surface. The time evolution of these quantities can be found in [25].

In the end, the components of anisotropies satisfy the following equations:

$$\ddot{M}_\parallel + 3\dot{N}\dot{M}_\parallel = \frac{1}{M_P^2}\hat{S}_\parallel + \mathcal{O}(m^2H^2)\,, \tag{5.20}$$

$$\ddot{M}_a + 3\dot{N}\dot{M}_a = \frac{1}{M_P^2}\hat{S}_a + \mathcal{O}(m^2H^2)\,, \tag{5.21}$$

$$\ddot{M}_\lambda + 3\dot{N}\dot{M}_\lambda = \frac{1}{M_P^2}\hat{S}_\lambda + \mathcal{O}(m^2H^2)\,. \tag{5.22}$$

The discussions in this section are valid before and after the relevant characteristic length scale are sub-horizon. It is important to note that we do not have any idea about the present state of anisotropy scales in the real Universe. However, in the long-wavelength limit, in which our separate universe recipe works, the dynamic of h_{ij} components can be found by replacing $(M_\parallel, M_a, M_\lambda)$ by $(h_\parallel, h_a, h_\lambda)$, and t with τ in equations (5.20)-(5.22), as prescribed by δM formalism in Sec. 4.

5.4 Choosing a Gauge

As we emphasized before, not all the perturbations are physical. A physical mode can be identified after fixing the gauge freedom. A useful gauge to work with is the transverse-traceless gauge in which $\psi = h_\parallel = h_a = 0$. This will give

$$h''_\lambda + 3N' h'_\lambda = \frac{1}{M_P^2}\hat{S}_\lambda + \mathcal{O}(m^2H^2, \epsilon^2)\,. \tag{5.23}$$

This is the known result for the propagation of gravitational waves . Since the background is time dependent only, $h_\lambda(\tau, x^i)$ has no correspondence in the background. By Stewart-Walker lemma [32, 36], such quantities are gauge invariant. Clearly, second order perturbations have first order perturbations acting as a background; so they are no longer gauge invariant. On the other hand, the changes in $\mathcal{M}_{ij}(t, \mathbf{x})$ under the coordinates transformations known as time slice orthogonal threading [19], is discussed in App. C. There, we show that $\mathcal{M}_{ij}(t, \mathbf{x})$ is gauge invariant up to $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$ as such h_λ is all order gauge invariant up to $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$. There are two comments about the physical modes denoted by (h_λ, S_λ): i) h_λ would remain constant or decay as a^{-3}, if the source term were unimportant or when the background become isotropic. ii) The back-reaction of the fields that source the anisotropies on the background fields dynamics may be considerable. These "indirect effects" can be seen from the continuity equation in an anisotropic universe (3.18). δN formalism automatically takes into account these effects.

Clearly, one can choose a different gauge; for example the longitudinal gauge in which $h_a = h_\lambda = 0$. this is the gauge used in [37]. A diagonal anisotropic stress (a nonzero $\hat{S}_\parallel$) plays role in the linear scalar perturbation analysis. One can identify two terms with different origins in $\delta\mathsf{N}$ (see Eq. (3.25) in [37])

$$\delta\mathsf{N} = \mathsf{N}_{,I}\delta\Phi_I + \mathsf{M}_{\parallel,I}\delta\Phi_I \,. \tag{5.24}$$

The indirect effect on Hubble expansion rate has been elaborated in [37].

6 Summary and Conclusion

We have applied the gradient expansion to the evolution equation of perturbations in an anisotropic (Bianchi) universe. Consequently, we presented a consistent separate universe approach to the perturbation theory. This has been demonstrated by the form invariance of Einstein constraint and dynamical equations at long-wavelength perturbation limit.

In particular, we have found how the different classes of perturbations can be absorbed in homogeneous but anisotropic background parameters. To be specific, the background geometrical shear can be redefined in such a way that absorb long-wavelength vector and tensor perturbations just like the scale factor does for scalar perturbation in the standard δN formalism.

We have obtained a very general powerful tool called δM formalism which relates the amplitude of spatial perturbations to the change in M_{ij}, which in turn is defined to measure the homogeneous changes in Euclidean metric. In particular, the change in the amplitude of a gravitational waves, with comoving wavelength k^{-1}, going from one time slice to another is equal to variations of integrated shear $M_\lambda = \int_{t_0}^{t} \sigma_\lambda \, \mathrm{d}t'$ calculated between two arbitrary initial and final hyper-surfaces. Unlike the δN formalism that there is a strict recipe for choosing initial and final hyper-surface, the choice of these hyper-surfaces are almost arbitrary expect the final surface must be picked where the geometry has been isotropized and the Universe evolves adiabatically. By the way, as one might be at the same time interested in studying the curvature perturbations, δN method dictates that the initial hyper-surface should be chosen to be any flat slice well after the time the desired mode exited the horizon while the final hyper-surface has to be a co-moving one.

Apart from theoretical interest in studying long-wavelength perturbations in the anisotropic background, the proposed δM formalism is a powerful method for studying the perturbations in anisotropic inflationary models [24]. Specifically, it is powerful tool for dealing non-trivial

interaction between scalar and tensor modes showing up in anisotropic inflationary models. In a word, employing the δM formalism substantially simplifies the calculations of the correlation functions of the perturbations in these models.

Acknowledgments

We gratefully acknowledge fruitful discussions with Misao Sasaki and Hassan Firouzjahi. We would like to thank Mohammad Nouri-zonoz, Kamal Hajian for precious comments. A.T.A thanks "Halghe" cosmology group for stimulating discussions. We wish to thank school of physics of IPM for hospitality. A.T.A and N.A thank university of Tehran for supporting this project under the grands provided by the research council. A.A.A is partially supported by deputy of research of the SUT.

A Conformal 3+1 Decomposition

In the ADM decomposition [20, 21], the metric is expressed as (3.1), with the following matrix form

$$g_{\alpha\beta} = \begin{bmatrix} -\alpha^2 + \beta^k\beta_k & \beta_i \\ \beta_j & \gamma_{ij} \end{bmatrix}, \qquad g^{\alpha\beta} = \begin{bmatrix} \dfrac{-1}{\alpha^2} & \dfrac{\beta^i}{\alpha^2} \\ \dfrac{\beta^j}{\alpha^2} & \gamma^{ij} - \dfrac{\beta^i\beta^j}{\alpha^2} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Any smooth physical space-time in the standard ADM formalism can be decomposed into a unit time-like vector $\boldsymbol{n}$ and a constant time hyper-surfaces, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_t$, which is normal to it. The components of $\boldsymbol{n}$ in the space-time (3.1) are given by

$$n_\mu = [-\alpha\,, 0]\,, \quad n^\mu = \frac{1}{\alpha}\left[1, -\beta^i\right]. \tag{A.1}$$

The induced metric (the first fundamental form) on $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_t$, is defined as

$$\Sigma_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} + n_\mu n_\nu\,. \tag{A.2}$$

Therefore the spatial part of induced metric is γ_{ij}. The extrinsic curvature (the second fundamental form) of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_t$, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{K}}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{K}_{ij} \equiv -\nabla_i n_j = \frac{1}{2\alpha}(D_i\beta_j + D_j\beta_i - \dot{\gamma}_{ij})\,, \tag{A.3}$$

where the dots denote time derivatives with respect to cosmic time t, and $\boldsymbol{\nabla}$ and $\boldsymbol{D}$ are the covariant differential operators constructed by using $g_{\mu\nu}$ and γ_{ij} by means of related Christoffel symbols $\Gamma^\alpha_{\mu\nu}$ and ${}^3\Gamma^k_{ij}$, respectively. One can check that $\mathcal{K}_{ij} = \alpha\Gamma^0_{ij}$.

In the context of (3+1)-decomposition of Einstein equations, the dynamical variables are the spatial three metric, γ_{ij}, and the extrinsic curvature, $\mathcal{K}_{ij}$. The components of $(n,n) \equiv G_{\mu\nu}n^\mu n^\nu$, and $(n,i) \equiv G_{\mu\nu}n^\mu\Sigma^\nu_i$, of the Einstein equations yield Hamiltonian and momentum constraints, respectively and $(i,j) \equiv G_{\mu\nu}\Sigma^\mu_i\Sigma^\nu_j = G_{ij}$ components give the evolution equations for extrinsic curvature. The evolution equations for the spatial part of induced metric are given by the definitions of the extrinsic curvature (A.3).

To write down Einstein equations, $G_{\mu\nu} = M_P^{-2}T_{\mu\nu}$ where $M_P^{-2} = 8\pi G/c^4$ is the reduced Planck mass and G is the gravitational constant, we need a energy momentum tensor as a

source. It is convenient to represent the independent components of the energy momentum tensor as energy density $\mathcal{E} = T_{\mu\nu}n^\mu n^\nu$, momentum density $\mathcal{J}_i \equiv T_{\mu\nu}n^\mu \Sigma_i^\nu$, and stress tensor $\mathcal{S}_{ij} = T_{\mu\nu}\Sigma_i^\mu \Sigma_j^\nu$.

In the ADM decomposition the four constraints (one Hamiltonian and three momentum constraints) are

$$ {}^3\mathcal{R} + \mathcal{K}^2 - \mathcal{K}_{ij}\mathcal{K}^{ij} = \frac{2}{M_P^2}\mathcal{E}\,, \tag{A.4} $$

$$ D_j\mathcal{K}_i^j - D_i\mathcal{K} = -\frac{1}{M_P^2}\mathcal{J}_i\,. \tag{A.5} $$

Also two sets dynamical equations for γ_{ij} and $\mathcal{K}_{ij}$ are

$$ \partial_t\gamma_{ij} = -2\alpha\mathcal{K}_{ij} + D_i\beta_j + D_j\beta_i\,, \tag{A.6} $$

$$ \begin{aligned}(\partial_t - \beta^k\partial_k)\mathcal{K}_{ij} = {}& \mathcal{K}_{kj}\partial_i\beta^k + \mathcal{K}_{ik}\partial_j\beta^k - D_iD_j\alpha + \alpha({}^3\mathcal{R}_{ij} + \mathcal{K}\,\mathcal{K}_{ij} - 2\mathcal{K}_{ik}\mathcal{K}_j^k) \\ & - \frac{\alpha}{M_P^2}(\mathcal{S}_{ij} - \frac{1}{3}\gamma_{ij}\gamma^{kl}\mathcal{S}_{kl})\,, \end{aligned} \tag{A.7} $$

where ${}^3\mathcal{R}_{ij}$ and ${}^3\mathcal{R}$ are Ricci tensor and Ricci scalar of spatial three metric respectively and $\mathcal{K}$ is a trace part of $\mathcal{K}_{ij}$. The indices of $\mathcal{K}_{ij}$ are raised by γ^{ij}.

Since we are going to focus on tensor perturbations, the metric must be further decomposed, Because York [21, 38] showed conformal decompositions in 3+1 general relativity demonstrate that the two degrees of freedom of the gravitational field are carried by the conformal equivalence classes [3] of spatial three metrics. We follow Lichnerowicz [21] who has decomposed the spatial metric $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ into a positive scalar field $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ and an auxiliary metric $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$:

$$ \boldsymbol{\gamma} = e^{2\boldsymbol{\Theta}}\,\tilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\,. \tag{A.8} $$

This relation is a conformal transformation and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ a conformal spatial three metric. We go further through enfolding determinant part of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ into $e^{2\mathcal{N}}$ and make an unit-determinant conformal metric $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$, $\hat{\gamma} = \det[\hat{\gamma}_{ij}] = 1$,

$$ \gamma_{ij} = e^{2\mathcal{N}}\hat{\gamma}_{ij}\,. \tag{A.9} $$

So we have $\hat{\gamma}_{ij} = \gamma^{-1/3}\,\gamma_{ij}$, where $\gamma = \det[\gamma_{ij}]$. In fact $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ is a tensor density of weight -2/3. This unit-determinant metric can be used to decompose the spatial metric into the expansion and anisotropic parts as Misner and Hawking have done for studying Bianchi space-times [33, 34].

For further simplifications of equations, all the spatial quantities $(\mathcal{K}_{ij}, {}^3\mathcal{R}_{ij}, \mathcal{S}_{ij})$ are decomposed into trace and traceless parts

$$ \mathcal{K}_{ij} = \frac{1}{3}\mathcal{K}\,\gamma_{ij} + e^{2\mathcal{N}}\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{ij}\,, \tag{A.10} $$

$$ {}^3\mathcal{R}_{ij} = \frac{1}{3}{}^3\mathcal{R}\gamma_{ij} + e^{2\mathcal{N}}\,{}^3\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{ij}\,, \tag{A.11} $$

$$ \mathcal{S}_{ij} = \frac{1}{3}\mathcal{S}\,\gamma_{ij} + e^{2\mathcal{N}}\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{ij}\,, \tag{A.12} $$

[3] All metrics that can be related to $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ by a conformal transformation such as (A.8) are in the same class

where $\mathcal{K} = \gamma^{ij}\mathcal{K}_{ij}$, ${}^3\mathcal{R} = \gamma^{ij}{}^3\mathcal{R}_{ij}$ and $\mathcal{S} = \gamma^{ij}\mathcal{S}_{ij}$. The indices of the traceless quantities, $(\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{ij}, {}^3\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{ij}, \hat{\mathcal{S}}_{ij})$ are raised and lowered by $\hat{\gamma}^{ij}$ and $\hat{\gamma}_{ij}$, respectively. The explicit forms of $\mathcal{K}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{ij}$ are given by

$$\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}^i_i = \gamma^{ij}\mathcal{K}_{ij} = \frac{1}{\alpha}(D_k\beta^k - 3\dot{\mathcal{N}})\,, \tag{A.13}$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{ij} = e^{-2\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{K}_{ij} - \frac{1}{3}\mathcal{K}\gamma_{ij}) = -\frac{1}{2\alpha}\dot{\hat{\gamma}}_{ij} + \frac{e^{-2\mathcal{N}}}{2\alpha}(D_i\beta_j + D_j\beta_i - \frac{2}{3}D_k\beta^k\gamma_{ij})\,. \tag{A.14}$$

It is easy to show that $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{ij}$ is traceless,

$$\hat{\mathcal{A}}^i{}_i = -\frac{1}{2\alpha}\hat{\gamma}^{ij}\dot{\hat{\gamma}}_{ij} = -\frac{1}{2\alpha}\dot{\hat{\gamma}} = 0\,. \tag{A.15}$$

${}^3\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{ij}$, $\mathcal{S}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{ij}$ can be interpreted as anisotropic Ricci tensor, isotropic and anisotropic pressure, respectively.

By applying the above decompositions to Eqs. (A.4)-(A.7), one finds the equations governing the newly defined fields. The constraint equations turn into

$${}^3\mathcal{R} + \frac{2}{3}\mathcal{K}^2 - \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{ij}\hat{\mathcal{A}}^{ij} = \frac{2}{M_P^2}\mathcal{E}\,, \tag{A.16}$$

$$D_j\hat{\mathcal{A}}^j_i - \frac{2}{3}\partial_i\mathcal{K} = -\frac{1}{M_P^2}\mathcal{J}_i\,. \tag{A.17}$$

The dynamical equations for the spatial metric $(\mathcal{N}, \hat{\gamma}_{ij})$ are

$$(\partial_t - \beta^k\partial_k)\mathcal{N} = \frac{1}{3}(-\alpha\mathcal{K} + \partial_k\beta^k)\,, \tag{A.18}$$

$$(\partial_t - \beta^k\partial_k)\hat{\gamma}_{ij} = -2\alpha\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{ij} + \hat{\gamma}_{ik}\partial_j\beta^k + \hat{\gamma}_{jk}\partial_i\beta^k - \frac{2}{3}\hat{\gamma}_{ij}\partial_k\beta^k\,. \tag{A.19}$$

The dynamical equations for extrinsic curvature $(\mathcal{K}, \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{ij})$ are

$$(\partial_t - \beta^k\partial_k)\mathcal{K} = \alpha(\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{ij}\hat{\mathcal{A}}^{ij} + \frac{1}{3}\mathcal{K}^2) - \gamma^{ij}D_iD_j\alpha + \frac{\alpha}{2M_P^2}(\mathcal{E} + \mathcal{S})\,, \tag{A.20}$$

$$\begin{aligned}(\partial_t - \beta^k\partial_k)\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{ij} = {}& \alpha(\mathcal{K}\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{ij} - 2\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{ik}\hat{\mathcal{A}}^k_j) - \frac{\alpha}{M_P^2}\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{ij} + \alpha\,{}^3\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{ij} - e^{-2\mathcal{N}}(D_iD_j\alpha - \frac{1}{3}\gamma_{ij}D_kD^k\alpha) \\ & + \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{ik}\partial_j\beta^k + \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{jk}\partial_i\beta^k - \frac{2}{3}\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{ij}\partial_k\beta^k\,.\end{aligned} \tag{A.21}$$

The above equations in addition to matter equations constitute a complete set to solve. Matter obeys the field equations and the continuity equations. The continuity equations, $\nabla_\nu T^{\nu\mu} = 0$, are given by

$$(\partial_t - \beta^k\partial_k)\mathcal{E} - \alpha\Big(\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E} + \frac{1}{3}\mathcal{S}) + \hat{\mathcal{K}}_{ij}\hat{\mathcal{S}}^{ij}\Big) + \alpha D_i\mathcal{J}^i + 2\mathcal{J}^iD_i\alpha = 0\,, \tag{A.22}$$

$$(\partial_t - \beta^k\partial_k)\mathcal{J}_i - \alpha\Big(\mathcal{K}\mathcal{J}_i - D_j\mathcal{S}^j_i\Big) + \Big(\mathcal{E}\delta^j_i + \mathcal{S}^j_i\Big)D_j\alpha = 0\,. \tag{A.23}$$

The symmetric unit-determinant conformal metric $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ is usually expressed in terms of a symmetric trace-free matrix $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{M}}$ as

$$\hat{\gamma}_{ij} = (e^{2\boldsymbol{\mathcal{M}}})_{ij}\,. \tag{A.24}$$

Then, as is well known $\det[\hat{\gamma}_{ij}] = e^{2Tr\boldsymbol{\mathcal{M}}} = 1$ where $Tr\boldsymbol{\mathcal{M}} = \mathcal{M}^i_i = 0$. The matrix exponential is defined via Taylor expansion.

$$(e^{2\boldsymbol{\mathcal{M}}})_{ij} = \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \frac{(2\boldsymbol{\mathcal{M}})^n_{ij}}{n!}$$
$$= \delta_{ij} + 2\mathcal{M}_{ij} + \frac{2^2}{2!}\mathcal{M}^k_i\mathcal{M}_{kj} + \frac{2^3}{3!}\mathcal{M}^k_i\mathcal{M}_{kl}\mathcal{M}^l_j + \dots\,, \tag{A.25}$$

in which $\mathcal{M}^i_j = \delta^{ik}\mathcal{M}_{kj}$.

A.1 Fluid and Scalar Field Description

If matter is described as a fluid with 4-velocity u^μ, its energy-momentum tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$ will be decomposed uniquely as

$$T_{\mu\nu} = \rho u_\mu u_\nu + pP_{\mu\nu} + q_\mu u_\nu + q_\nu u_\mu + \pi_{\mu\nu}\,, \tag{A.26}$$

supplemented with the following conditions

$$q_\mu u^\mu = 0 = \pi_{\mu\nu}u^\nu\,,\ \pi^\mu{}_\mu = 0\,,\ \pi_{\mu\nu} = \pi_{\nu\mu}\,,\ \pi_{\mu\nu}P^{\mu\nu} = 0\,. \tag{A.27}$$

Here ρ is the relativistic energy density relative to u^μ (measured by an observer at rest with the fluid), p is the isotropic pressure, q^μ usually is referred to as "heat conduction", which is also the energy flux (relativistic momentum density) relative to u^μ and $\pi_{\mu\nu}$ is the trace-free anisotropic pressure (stress) tensor. Also $P_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} + u_\mu u_\nu$ is the projection tensor onto the surface of perpendicular to u_μ.

The components of fluid's four-velocity,

$$u^\mu = \frac{\mathrm{d}x^\mu}{\mathrm{d}\tau},\quad u^\alpha u_\alpha = -1\,, \tag{A.28}$$

where τ is proper time measured along the world line, are given by

$$\begin{aligned} u^o &= [\alpha^2 - (\beta^k + v^k)(\beta_k + v_k)]^{-1/2}\,,\\ u^i &= u^o v^i\,,\\ u_o &= -u^o[\alpha^2 - \beta^k(\beta_k + v_k)]\,,\\ u_i &= u^o(v_i + \beta_i)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{A.29}$$

Here v^i is the spatial velocity, $v^i \equiv \mathrm{d}x^i/\mathrm{d}t = u^i/u^0$, and $v_i = \gamma_{ij}v^j$.

The hydrodynamic equations are the energy (continuity equation) and momentum (Euler equations) conservation which can be extracted form $\nabla_\nu T^{\nu\mu} = 0$ as follow

$$-u_\mu\nabla_\nu T^{\nu\mu} = 0\,, \tag{A.30}$$
$$(g^\alpha_\mu + u^\alpha u_\mu)\nabla_\nu T^{\nu\mu} = 0\,. \tag{A.31}$$

One can think a scalar field instead of a fluid. If we assume that the Universe is filled with a scalar field φ, described by the following Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2}\partial^\mu\varphi\partial_\mu\varphi - V\,, \tag{A.32}$$

the stress-energy tensor of it reads as

$$T_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu\varphi\partial_\nu\varphi + g_{\mu\nu}\left(-\frac{1}{2}\partial^\alpha\varphi\partial_\alpha\varphi - V\right), \tag{A.33}$$

and its equation of motion as

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{g}}\partial_\mu\left(\sqrt{g}g^{\mu\nu}\partial_\nu\varphi\right) - V_\varphi = 0\,, \tag{A.34}$$

where $V_\varphi = \dfrac{\mathrm{d}V}{\mathrm{d}\varphi}$ and $g = \det[g_{\mu\nu}]$.

B $\boldsymbol{M}$ as an Integrated Shear

In this appendix we investigate conditions under which $\boldsymbol{M}$ can be interpreted as integrated shear. The bars over the background shear and the background unit-determinant metric are omitted here for brevity.

Before moving on, we will derive the explicit form of shear in terms of matrix M^i_j. We start from the symmetry property of $\hat{\gamma}_{ij}$, $\hat{\gamma}^{ij}$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{ij}$,

$$\hat{\sigma}^k_i\hat{\gamma}_{kj} = \hat{\sigma}^k_j\hat{\gamma}_{ki}\,, \tag{B.1}$$

to show $\hat{\sigma}^i_j = \hat{\gamma}^{ik}\hat{\sigma}_{kj} = \hat{\sigma}_{jk}\hat{\gamma}^{ki}$. With the help of $\hat{\gamma}^{ij} = (e^{-2M})^{ij}$ and applying Baker-Hausdorff formula [4] into $\hat{\sigma}^i_j = \hat{\sigma}_{jk}\hat{\gamma}^{ki}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\sigma}^i_j &= \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}(e^{2\boldsymbol{M}})_{jk}\ (e^{-2\boldsymbol{M}})^{ki} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{n=1,3,5,\ldots}^{\infty}\frac{2^n}{n!}\underbrace{\Big[\boldsymbol{M},\Big[\boldsymbol{M}\cdots[\boldsymbol{M}}_{\text{n-1}},\dot{\boldsymbol{M}}\,]\Big]\cdots\Big]^i_j + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{n=2,4,6,\ldots}^{\infty}\frac{2^n}{n!}\underbrace{\Big[\boldsymbol{M},\Big[\boldsymbol{M}\cdots[\boldsymbol{M}}_{\text{n-1}},\dot{\boldsymbol{M}}\,]\Big]\cdots\Big]^i_j .\end{aligned} \tag{B.2}$$

On the other hand $\hat{\sigma}^i_j = \hat{\gamma}^{ik}\hat{\sigma}_{kj}$ gives [5]

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\sigma}^i_j &= \frac{1}{2}(e^{-2\boldsymbol{M}})^{ik}\ \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}(e^{2\boldsymbol{M}})_{kj} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{n=1,3,5,\ldots}^{\infty}\frac{2^n}{n!}\underbrace{\Big[\cdots\Big[}_{\text{n-1}}[\,\dot{\boldsymbol{M}}\,,\underbrace{\boldsymbol{M}]\cdots\boldsymbol{M}}_{\text{n-1}}\Big],\boldsymbol{M}\Big]^i_j + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{n=2,4,6,\ldots}^{\infty}\frac{2^n}{n!}\underbrace{\Big[\cdots\Big[}_{\text{n-1}}[\,\dot{\boldsymbol{M}}\,,\underbrace{\boldsymbol{M}]\cdots\boldsymbol{M}}_{\text{n-1}}\Big],\boldsymbol{M}\Big]^i_j .\end{aligned} \tag{B.3}$$

By using $[\boldsymbol{A},\boldsymbol{B}] = -[\boldsymbol{B},\boldsymbol{A}]$ and equating (B.2) and (B.3) we have

$$\sum_{n=2,4,6,\ldots}^{\infty}\frac{2^n}{n!}\underbrace{\Big[\cdots\Big[}_{\text{n-1}}[\,\dot{\boldsymbol{M}}\,,\underbrace{\boldsymbol{M}]\cdots\boldsymbol{M}}_{\text{n-1}}\Big],\boldsymbol{M}\Big]^i_j = 0\,. \tag{B.4}$$

[4] $\dfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}e^{M}\,e^{-M} = \dot{M} + \dfrac{1}{2!}[M,\dot{M}] + \dfrac{1}{3!}[M,[M,\dot{M}]] + \ldots\,.$

[5] $e^{-M}\dfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}e^{M} = \dot{M} + \dfrac{1}{2!}[\dot{M},M] + \dfrac{1}{3!}[[\dot{M},M],M] + \ldots\,.$

Therefore the shear will be

$$\hat{\sigma}^i_j = \dot{M}^i_j + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{n=3,5,\ldots}^{\infty}\frac{2^n}{n!}\Big[\underbrace{\cdots\Big[}_{\text{n-1}}[\,\dot{\boldsymbol{M}}\,,\underbrace{\boldsymbol{M}]\cdots\boldsymbol{M}\Big],\boldsymbol{M}\Big]^i_j}_{\text{n-1}}\,. \tag{B.5}$$

In Sec. 5.1 We defined m as a measure of anisotropy. Therefore (B.5) results in [6]

$$\hat{\sigma}^i_j = \dot{M}^i_j + \mathcal{O}(m^3 H)\,. \tag{B.6}$$

In general, M^i_j cannot be considered as an integrated shear. However, if $[\boldsymbol{M},\dot{\boldsymbol{M}}]=0$, this would be the case. There are some trivial cases that $[\boldsymbol{M},\dot{\boldsymbol{M}}]=0$, for example: $\boldsymbol{M}$ is a diagonal matrix or when time independence of $\boldsymbol{M}$ can be factored out, e.g. $M^i_j = e^{i\omega t}G^i_j$, where G^i_j is a constant matrix.

Let us investigate some other situations in which $[\dot{\boldsymbol{M}},\boldsymbol{M}]=0$, $\big[[\dot{\boldsymbol{M}},\boldsymbol{M}],\boldsymbol{M}\big]=0$, ... A trace-less symmetric matrix $\boldsymbol{M}$ may be expressed in terms of an orthogonal matrix $\boldsymbol{O}$ and a diagonal trace-free matrix $\boldsymbol{D}$,

$$\boldsymbol{M} = \boldsymbol{O}\boldsymbol{D}\boldsymbol{O}^T\,. \tag{B.7}$$

Then

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{M}} = \boldsymbol{O}[\boldsymbol{\Omega}\boldsymbol{D} + \dot{\boldsymbol{D}} - \boldsymbol{D}\boldsymbol{\Omega}]\boldsymbol{O}^T\,, \tag{B.8}$$

where antisymmetric $\boldsymbol{\Omega} = \boldsymbol{O}^T\dot{\boldsymbol{O}}$, represents the angular velocity of the principal axes of $\boldsymbol{M}$. Demanding

$$[\dot{\boldsymbol{M}},\boldsymbol{M}] = 0\,, \tag{B.9}$$
$$\big[[\dot{\boldsymbol{M}},\boldsymbol{M}],\boldsymbol{M}\big] = 0\,, \tag{B.10}$$
$$\vdots$$

results in

$$\Omega_{ij}(d_{(i)} - d_{(j)})^2 = 0\,, \tag{B.11}$$
$$\Omega_{ij}(d_{(i)} - d_{(j)})^3 = 0\,, \tag{B.12}$$
$$\vdots$$

where $D_{ij} = d_{(i)}\delta_{ij}$, and there is no summation on (i) and (j). Therefore, requiring that $\Big[...\big[[\dot{\boldsymbol{M}},\boldsymbol{M}],\boldsymbol{M}\big],...\Big] = 0$ results in $[\dot{\boldsymbol{M}},\boldsymbol{M}]=0$. There are three solutions for Eqs. (B.11) and (B.12):

1^{st} $\boldsymbol{D}=0$, so $\boldsymbol{M}=0$; FLRW space-time,

2^{nd} $\boldsymbol{\Omega}=0$, so $\boldsymbol{O}=const.$ matrix. i.e. $\boldsymbol{M}$ can be diagonalized by a constant matrix $\boldsymbol{O}$ at any constant time hyper-surfaces.

[6] We note that $\hat{\sigma}_{ij} = \hat{\gamma}_{ik}\hat{\sigma}^k_j = \dot{M}_{ij} + \mathcal{O}(m^2 H)$, where $M_{ij} = M^i_j$.

3^{rd} Each of $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ and $\boldsymbol{D}$ has only one degree of freedom:

$$\boldsymbol{\Omega} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \omega & 0 \\ -\omega & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \boldsymbol{D} = \begin{pmatrix} d & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & d & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2d \end{pmatrix}. \tag{B.13}$$

So in this case $\boldsymbol{M}$ has two degrees of freedom and the space-time would be a Bianchi-I with planar symmetry. This is the case has been studied in [37].

C Nonlinear Gauge Transformations

In this appendix, we investigate the behavior of $\mathcal{N}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{M}}$ under coordinate transformations. We define nonlinear gauge transformation by T as temporal generator and L^i as spatial shift generator,

$$t \to \tilde{t} = t + T(t, x^i)\,, \tag{C.1}$$
$$x^i \to \tilde{x}^i = x^i + L^i(t, x^i)\,, \tag{C.2}$$

or conversely

$$t = \tilde{t} + \tilde{T}(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}^i)\,, \tag{C.3}$$
$$x^i = \tilde{x}^i + \tilde{L}^i(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}^i)\,. \tag{C.4}$$

Under any change of the coordinates, the line element remains invariant,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}s^2 &= -(\alpha^2 - \beta_k\beta^k)\,\mathrm{d}t^2 + 2\,\beta_i\,\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}x^i + \gamma_{ij}\,\mathrm{d}x^i\,\mathrm{d}x^j \\ &= -(\tilde{\alpha}^2 - \tilde{\beta}_k\tilde{\beta}^k)\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{t}^2 + 2\,\tilde{\beta}_i\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{t}\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{x}^i + \tilde{\gamma}_{ij}\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{x}^i\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{x}^j\,. \end{aligned} \tag{C.5}$$

Equating the coefficient of $\mathrm{d}\tilde{t}^2$, $\mathrm{d}\tilde{t}\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{x}^i$, and $\mathrm{d}\tilde{x}^i\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{x}^j$ on both sides of the above, we obtain

$$\tilde{\alpha}^2 - \tilde{\beta}_k\tilde{\beta}^k = (\alpha^2 - \beta_k\beta^k)(1 + \partial_{\tilde{t}}\tilde{T})^2 - 2\,\beta_i(\partial_{\tilde{t}}\tilde{L}^i)(1 + \partial_{\tilde{t}}\tilde{T}) - \gamma_{ij}(\partial_{\tilde{t}}\tilde{L}^i)(\partial_{\tilde{t}}\tilde{L}^j)\,, \tag{C.6}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\beta}_i = &-(\alpha^2 - \beta_k\beta^k)\partial_{\tilde{i}}\tilde{T}(1 + \partial_{\tilde{t}}\tilde{T}) + \beta_j\big(\partial_{\tilde{i}}\tilde{T}\,\partial_{\tilde{t}}\tilde{L}^j + (1 + \partial_{\tilde{t}}\tilde{T})(\delta_i^j + \partial_{\tilde{i}}\tilde{L}^j)\big) \\ &+ \gamma_{ij}(\partial_{\tilde{t}}\tilde{L}^j)(\delta_i^j + \partial_{\tilde{i}}\tilde{L}^j)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{C.7}$$

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{ij} = -(\alpha^2 - \beta_k\beta^k)(\partial_{\tilde{i}}\tilde{T})(\partial_{\tilde{j}}\tilde{T}) + 2\,\beta_k(\partial_{\tilde{i}}\tilde{T})(\delta_j^k + \partial_{\tilde{j}}\tilde{L}^k) + \gamma_{kl}(\delta_i^k + \partial_{\tilde{i}}\tilde{L}^k)(\delta_j^l + \partial_{\tilde{j}}\tilde{L}^l)\,. \tag{C.8}$$

From (C.7) and $\beta_i \sim \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$, spatial shift generator L^i is also $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$. Hence, (C.8) can be rewritten as

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{ij}(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}^i) = \gamma_{ij}(t, x^i) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)\,. \tag{C.9}$$

By taking the determinant of both sides, we will get

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}^i) = \mathcal{N}(t, x^i) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)\,, \tag{C.10}$$

which results in

$$\tilde{N}(\tilde{t}) + \tilde{\psi}(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}^i) = N(t) + \psi(t, x^i) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)\,. \tag{C.11}$$

From equations (C.9) and (C.10) we have

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{ij}(\tilde{t},\tilde{x}^i) = \mathcal{M}_{ij}(t,x^i) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)\,, \tag{C.12}$$

and

$$\tilde{M}_{ij}(\tilde{t}) + \tilde{h}_{ij}(\tilde{t},\tilde{x}^i) = M_{ij}(t) + h_{ij}(t,x^i) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)\,. \tag{C.13}$$

It is easy to see that $\mathcal{M}_{ij}$ transforms as a rank 2 tensor under purely spatial coordinate transformations

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_i\tilde{x}^k\partial_j\tilde{x}^l\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{kl} &= (\delta_i^k + \partial_{\tilde{i}}\tilde{L}^k)(\delta_j^l + \partial_{\tilde{j}}\tilde{L}^l)\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{kl}\\ &= \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{ij}(\tilde{t},\tilde{x}^i) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)\\ &= \mathcal{M}_{ij}(t,x^i) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2).\end{aligned} \tag{C.14}$$

On the other hand we know $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ is a tensor density of weight -2/3,

$$\hat{\gamma}_{ij}(t,\boldsymbol{x}) = J^{-2/3}\;\partial_i\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}^k\;\partial_j\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}^l\;\tilde{\hat{\gamma}}_{kl}(\tilde{t},\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}})\,, \tag{C.15}$$

where

$$J = \det\left[\frac{\partial\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}^i}{\partial\boldsymbol{x}^j}\right] = \det\left[\delta_j^i + \partial_j\tilde{L}^i\right] = 1 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)\,. \tag{C.16}$$

Therefore we recover (C.12) again.

D Order Counting of Spatial Ricci Tensor

We use ADM metric (3.1) and calculate the Christoffel symbols

$$\Gamma^\alpha_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}g^{\alpha\beta}(\partial_\mu g_{\beta\nu} + \partial_\nu g_{\mu\beta} - \partial_\beta g_{\mu\nu})\,, \tag{D.1}$$

which by assuming $\beta_i \sim \partial_i \sim \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ yields

$$\Gamma^0_{00} = \acute{\alpha} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)\,, \tag{D.2}$$

$$\Gamma^0_{i0} = \frac{1}{\alpha}\partial_i\alpha + \frac{\beta^j}{\alpha}\acute{\gamma}_{ij} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) \tag{D.3}$$

$$= \frac{\acute{\mathcal{N}}}{\alpha}\beta_i + \frac{1}{2\alpha}e^{2\mathcal{N}}\beta^j\acute{\hat{\gamma}}_{ij} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)\,, \tag{D.4}$$

$$\Gamma^0_{ij} = \frac{1}{2\alpha}\acute{\gamma}_{ij} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) \tag{D.5}$$

$$= \frac{\acute{\mathcal{N}}}{\alpha}\gamma_{ij} + \frac{1}{2\alpha}e^{2\mathcal{N}}\acute{\hat{\gamma}}_{ij} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)\,, \tag{D.6}$$

$$\Gamma^i_{00} = -\beta^i\acute{\alpha} + \frac{1}{2}\gamma^{ij}(\alpha\partial_j\alpha + \partial_t\beta_j) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)\,, \tag{D.7}$$

$$\Gamma^i_{j0} = \frac{\alpha}{2}\gamma^{ik}\dot{\gamma}_{kj} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) \tag{D.8}$$

$$= \alpha\mathcal{N}\delta^i_j + \frac{\alpha}{2}\hat{\gamma}^{ik}\acute{\hat{\gamma}}_{kj} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)\,, \tag{D.9}$$

$$\Gamma^i_{jk} = {}^3\Gamma^i_{jk} - \frac{1}{2\alpha}\beta^i\acute{\gamma}_{jk} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)\,. \tag{D.10}$$

As noted before, the primes indicate derivatives with respect to proper time, ∂_τ, and ${}^3\Gamma^i_{jk}$ and ${}^3\hat{\Gamma}^i_{jk}$ are spatial Christoffel symbols related to γ_{ij} and $\hat{\gamma}_{ij}$, respectively,

$$
\begin{aligned}
{}^3\Gamma^i_{jk} &= \frac{1}{2}\gamma^{il}(\partial_j\gamma_{lk} + \partial_k\gamma_{jl} - \partial_l\gamma_{jk}) && \text{(D.11)}\\
&= {}^3\hat{\Gamma}^i_{jk} + \partial_j\mathcal{N}\delta^i_k + \partial_k\mathcal{N}\delta^i_j - \partial_l\mathcal{N}\hat{\gamma}^{il}\hat{\gamma}_{jk}\,, && \text{(D.12)}\\
{}^3\hat{\Gamma}^i_{jk} &= \frac{1}{2}\hat{\gamma}^{il}(\partial_j\hat{\gamma}_{lk} + \partial_k\hat{\gamma}_{jl} - \partial_l\hat{\gamma}_{jk})\,. && \text{(D.13)}
\end{aligned}
$$

It is easy to see that $\Gamma^0_{i0} \sim \Gamma^i_{00} \sim \Gamma^i_{jk} \sim {}^3\Gamma^i_{jk} \sim \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$, and therefore ${}^3\mathcal{R} \sim {}^3\mathcal{R}_{ij} \sim \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$.

References

[1] A. H. Guth, Phys. Rev. D **23**, 347 (1981); A. D. Linde, Phys. Lett. B **108**, 389 (1982); A. Albrecht and P. J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 1220 (1982).

[2] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* arXiv:1502.01592 [astro-ph.CO]; P. A. R. Ade *et al.* arXiv:1502.02114 [astro-ph.CO]; P. A. R. Ade *et al.* arXiv:1506.07135 [astro-ph.CO]; P. A. R. Ade *et al.* arXiv:1502.01589 [astro-ph.CO].

[3] J. M. Maldacena, JHEP **0305**, 013 (2003) [astro-ph/0210603].

[4] E. M. Lifshitz and I. M. Khalatnikov, Adv. Phys. **12**, 185 (1963).

[5] V. a. Belinsky, I. m. Khalatnikov and E. m. Lifshitz, Adv. Phys. **31**, 639 (1982).

[6] K. Tomita, Prog. Theor. Phys. **48**, 1503 (1972).

[7] K. Tomita, Prog. Theor. Phys. **54**, 730 (1975).

[8] D. S. Salopek and J. R. Bond, Phys. Rev. D **42**, 3936 (1990).

[9] G. L. Comer, N. Deruelle, D. Langlois and J. Parry, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 2759 (1994).

[10] N. Deruelle and D. Langlois, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 2007 (1995) [gr-qc/9411040].

[11] M. Sasaki and T. Tanaka, Prog. Theor. Phys. **99**, 763 (1998) [gr-qc/9801017].

[12] V. Muller, H. J. Schmidt and A. A. Starobinsky, Class. Quant. Grav. **7**, 1163 (1990); O. Iguchi, H. Ishihara and J. Soda, Phys. Rev. D **55**, 3337 (1997). [gr-qc/9606012]; O. Iguchi and H. Ishihara, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 3216 (1997). [gr-qc/9611047]; I. M. Khalatnikov, A. Y. Kamenshchik, M. Martellini and A. A. Starobinsky, JCAP **0303**, 001 (2003). [gr-qc/0301119]; D. S. Salopek, Phys. Rev. D **43**, 3214 (1991); D. S. Salopek and J. M. Stewart, Class. Quant. Grav. **9**, 1943 (1992); J. Parry, D. S. Salopek and J. M. Stewart, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 2872 (1994). [gr-qc/9310020]; J. Soda, H. Ishihara and O. Iguchi, Prog. Theor. Phys. **94**, 781 (1995). [gr-qc/9509008]; A. Taruya and Y. Nambu, Prog. Theor. Phys. **95**, 295 (1996). [gr-qc/9510010]; Y. Nambu and A. Taruya, Class. Quant. Grav. **13**, 705 (1996). [astro-ph/9411013]; M. Shibata and M. Sasaki, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 084002 (1999) [gr-qc/9905064]; A. A. Starobinsky, JETP Lett. **37**, 66 (1983); I. M. Khalatnikov and A. Y. Kamenshchik, Class. Quant. Grav. **19**, 3845 (2002) [gr-qc/0204045]; A. A. Starobinsky, JETP Lett. **42**, 152 (1985) [Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **42**, 124 (1985)]; J. M. Bardeen, Phys. Rev. D **22**, 1882 (1980).

[13] H. Kodama and T. Hamazaki, Phys. Rev. D **57**, 7177 (1998) [gr-qc/9712045]; T. Hamazaki, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 103513 (2008) [arXiv:0811.2366 [astro-ph]]; D. H. Lyth and Y. Rodriguez, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 123508 (2005) [astro-ph/0502578]; D. Seery and J. E. Lidsey, JCAP **0509**, 011 (2005) [astro-ph/0506056]; S. Yokoyama, T. Suyama and T. Tanaka, JCAP **0707**, 013 (2007) [arXiv:0705.3178 [astro-ph]]; M. Sasaki, Prog. Theor. Phys. **120**, 159 (2008) [arXiv:0805.0974 [astro-ph]]; S. Yokoyama, T. Suyama and T. Tanaka, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 083511 (2008) [arXiv:0711.2920 [astro-ph]]; S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 123521 (2008) [arXiv:0808.2909

[hep-th]]; S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 043504 (2009) [arXiv:0810.2831 [hep-ph]]; Y. i. Takamizu and S. Mukohyama, JCAP **0901**, 013 (2009) [arXiv:0810.0746 [gr-qc]]; Y. i. Takamizu, S. Mukohyama, M. Sasaki and Y. Tanaka, JCAP **1006**, 019 (2010) [arXiv:1004.1870 [astro-ph.CO]]; Y. i. Takamizu and J. Yokoyama, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 043504 (2011) [arXiv:1011.4566 [astro-ph.CO]].

[14] Y. Tanaka and M. Sasaki, Prog. Theor. Phys. **117**, 633 (2007) [gr-qc/0612191]; Y. Tanaka and M. Sasaki, Prog. Theor. Phys. **118**, 455 (2007) [arXiv:0706.0678 [gr-qc]].

[15] D. H. Lyth and D. Wands, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 103515 (2003) [astro-ph/0306498].

[16] D. Wands, K. A. Malik, D. H. Lyth and A. R. Liddle, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 043527 (2000) [astro-ph/0003278].

[17] A. A. Starobinsky, Phys. Lett. B **117**, 175 (1982); M. Sasaki and E. D. Stewart, Prog. Theor. Phys. **95**, 71 (1996) [astro-ph/9507001]; D. H. Lyth and Y. Rodriguez, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 121302 (2005) [astro-ph/0504045]; A. Naruko, Europhys. Lett. **98**, 69001 (2012) [arXiv:1202.1516 [astro-ph.CO]]; M. Dias, R. H. Ribeiro and D. Seery, JCAP **1310**, 062 (2013) [arXiv:1210.7800 [astro-ph.CO]]; D. Langlois, F. Vernizzi and D. Wands, JCAP **0812**, 004 (2008) [arXiv:0809.4646 [astro-ph]];

[18] N. S. Sugiyama, E. Komatsu and T. Futamase, Phys. Rev. D **87**, no. 2, 023530 (2013) [arXiv:1208.1073 [gr-qc]].

[19] A. Naruko, Y. i. Takamizu and M. Sasaki, PTEP **2013**, 043E01 (2013) [arXiv:1210.6525 [astro-ph.CO]].

[20] R. L. Arnowitt, S. Deser and C. W. Misner, Gen. Rel. Grav. **40**, 1997 (2008) [arXiv:gr-qc/0405109 [gr-qc]].

[21] Éric Gourgoulhon, *3+1 Formalism in General Relativity, Bases of Numerical Relativity* (Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2012)

[22] D. H. Lyth, K. A. Malik and M. Sasaki, JCAP **0505**, 004 (2005) [astro-ph/0411220].

[23] L. Bordin, P. Creminelli, M. Mirbabayi and J. Noreña, arXiv:1605.08424 [astro-ph.CO].

[24] A. Maleknejad, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari and J. Soda, Phys. Rept. **528**, 161 (2013) [arXiv:1212.2921 [hep-th]]; R. Emami, arXiv:1511.01683 [astro-ph.CO]; R. Emami, H. Firouzjahi and M. Zarei, Phys. Rev. D **90**, no. 2, 023504 (2014) [arXiv:1401.4406 [hep-th]]; X. Chen, R. Emami, H. Firouzjahi and Y. Wang, JCAP **1408**, 027 (2014) [arXiv:1404.4083 [astro-ph.CO]]; R. Emami and H. Firouzjahi, JCAP **1310**, 041 (2013) [arXiv:1301.1219 [hep-th]]; A. A. Abolhasani, R. Emami and H. Firouzjahi, JCAP **1405**, 016 (2014) [arXiv:1311.0493 [hep-th]]; R. Emami and H. Firouzjahi, JCAP **1201**, 022 (2012) [arXiv:1111.1919 [astro-ph.CO]]; R. Emami, H. Firouzjahi, S. M. Sadegh Movahed and M. Zarei, JCAP **1102**, 005 (2011) [arXiv:1010.5495 [astro-ph.CO]]; J. D. Barrow and S. Hervik, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 023007 (2006) [gr-qc/0511127]; J. D. Barrow and S. Hervik, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 023513 (2010) [arXiv:0911.3805 [gr-qc]]; A. Golovnev, V. Mukhanov and V. Vanchurin, JCAP **0806**, 009 (2008) [arXiv:0802.2068 [astro-ph]]; S. Kanno, M. Kimura, J. Soda and S. Yokoyama, JCAP **0808**, 034 (2008) [arXiv:0806.2422 [hep-ph]]; J. Soda, Class. Quant. Grav. **29**, 083001 (2012) [arXiv:1201.6434 [hep-th]]; A. E. Gumrukcuoglu, B. Himmetoglu and M. Peloso, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 063528 (2010) [arXiv:1001.4088 [astro-ph.CO]].

[25] T. S. Pereira, C. Pitrou and J. P. Uzan, JCAP **0709**, 006 (2007) [arXiv:0707.0736 [astro-ph]].

[26] C. Pitrou, T. S. Pereira and J. P. Uzan, JCAP **0804**, 004 (2008) [arXiv:0801.3596 [astro-ph]].

[27] B. L. Hu, Phys. Rev. D **18**, 969 (1978); P. G. Miedema and W. A. van Leeuwen, Class. Quant. Grav. **9**, S183 (1992); P. G. Miedema and W. A. van Leeuwen, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 3151 (1993); H. T. Cho and A. D. Speliotopoulos, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 5445 (1995) [gr-qc/9504046]; A. E. Gumrukcuoglu, L. Kofman and M. Peloso, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 103525 (2008) [arXiv:0807.1335 [astro-ph]].

[28] D. Saadeh, S. M. Feeney, A. Pontzen, H. V. Peiris and J. D. McEwen, arXiv:1605.07178 [astro-ph.CO].

[29] A. Pontzen and A. Challinor, Class. Quant. Grav. **28**, 185007 (2011) [arXiv:1009.3935 [gr-qc]].

[30] C. Pitrou, T. S. Pereira and J. P. Uzan, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 2, 023501 (2015) [arXiv:1503.01125 [astro-ph.CO]].

[31] M. Bruni, L. Gualtieri and C. F. Sopuerta, Class. Quant. Grav. **20**, 535 (2003) [gr-qc/0207105].

[32] C. F. Sopuerta, M. Bruni and L. Gualtieri, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 064002 (2004) [gr-qc/0306027].

[33] C. W. Misner, Astrophys. J. **151**, 431 (1968).

[34] S. W. Hawking, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **142**, 129 (1969).

[35] K. Dimopoulos, M. Karciauskas, D. H. Lyth and Y. Rodriguez, JCAP **0905**, 013 (2009) [arXiv:0809.1055 [astro-ph]].

[36] J. M. Stewart and M. Walker, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A **341**, 49 (1974).

[37] A. A. Abolhasani, R. Emami, J. T. Firouzjaee and H. Firouzjahi, JCAP **1308**, 016 (2013) [arXiv:1302.6986 [astro-ph.CO]].

[38] J. W. York, Jr., Phys. Rev. Lett. **26**, 1656 (1971); J. W. York, Jr., Phys. Rev. Lett. **28**, 1082 (1972).